IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(Attorney Docket № 14190US02)

In the Application of:	**Electronically filed on 07-JAN-2008**
Richard Martin, et al.	
Serial № 10/657,942	
Filed: September 9, 2003	
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR HARDWARE ACCELERATION IN A HYBRID WIRED/WIRELESS LOCAL AREA NETWORK	
Examiner: Simon A. Goetze	
Group Art Unit: 2617	
Confirmation № 1603	

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated July 13, 2007 ("Final Office Action"), in which claims 1-27 were finally rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("Board") reverses the final rejection of claims 1-27 of the present application. **The Applicant notes that this Appeal Brief is timely filed within the period for reply that ends on January 7, 2008.**

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

Broadcom Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of California, and having a place of business at 5300 California Avenue, Irvine, California 92617, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 014199, Frame 0985 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 1-27 were finally rejected. Pending claims 1-27 are the subject of this appeal.

The present application includes claims 1-27, which are pending in the present application. Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,474, issued to Eichert, et al. (hereinafter, Eichert), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069278, issued to

Forslow (hereinafter, Forslow). *See* the Final Office Action at page 3. The Applicant identifies claims 1-27 as the claims that are being appealed. The text of the pending claims is provided in the Claims Appendix.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

The Applicant has not amended any claims subsequent to the final rejection of claims 1-27 mailed on July 13, 2007.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

The invention of claim 1 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 8-9. Aspects of the invention may be found in a method and system for hardware acceleration in a hybrid wired/wireless local area network (e.g., network 1000 in FIG. 10). *See* the present application, page 8, lines 2-3. A method for hardware acceleration may comprise the step of creating at least one policy to be distributed among one or more of a plurality of access point groups. *See id.* at page 8, lines 3-5; access point groups 1050-1058 in FIG. 10. A method for hardware acceleration may further comprise the step of detecting at least one client movement from one access point groups to another, and distributing associated policy among one or more of a

plurality of access point groups. *See id.* at page 8, lines 5-8. At least one policy may be associated with a particular one of the access point groups. *See id.* at page 8, lines 8-9. The associated policy may be identified and distributed to one or more access points in an access point group. *See id.* at page 8, lines 9-10.

Claims 2-9 are dependent upon claim 1.

The invention of claim 10 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 8-9. Another embodiment of the invention may provide a machine-readable storage, having stored thereon a computer program having at least one code section for hardware acceleration, the at least one code section being executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform the steps described above. *See id.* at page 8, lines 20-23.

Claims 11-18 are dependent upon claim 10.

The invention of claim 19 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 8-9. Another embodiment of the invention may also provide a system for hardware acceleration in a hybrid wired/wireless local area network. *See id.* at page 8, lines 24-25. A system for hardware acceleration may comprise at least one processor for creating at least one policy to be distributed among one or more of a plurality of access point groups. *See id.* at page 8, lines 25-27. The processor may further detect at least one client movement from one access point groups to another access point group and

accordingly distribute associated policy among one or more of a plurality of access point groups. *See id.* at page 8, line 27 – page 9, line 3. The at least one processor may associate the policy with a particular one of the access point groups. *See id.* at page 9, lines 3-4. After identification of the policy, a transmitter may distribute the policy to one or more access points in an access point group. *See id.* at page 9, lines 4-6.

Claims 20-27 are dependent upon claim 19.

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,474, issued to Eichert, et al. (hereinafter, Eichert), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069278, issued to Forslow (hereinafter, Forslow).

ARGUMENT
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,474, issued to Eichert, et al. (hereinafter, Eichert), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069278, issued to Forslow (hereinafter, Forslow). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections at least based on the following remarks.

I. The Proposed Combination of Eichert and Forslow Does Not Render Claims 1-27 Unpatentable

The Applicant turns to the rejection of claims 1-27 as being unpatentable over Eichert in view of Forslow. The Applicant notes that the proposed combination of Eichert and Forslow forms the basis for all of the pending rejections.

A1. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 10, and 19

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 103(a), the Applicant submits that the combination of Eichert and Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "**associating** said at least one **policy with** a particular **one of said access point groups**," as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1 (emphasis added). The Final Office Action states the following:

> Eichert et al. discloses a method for hardware acceleration in a wired
> local area network, the method comprising:

6

associating said at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups *(policy is distributed to the different groups of network devices and end systems - Figures 1 and 3 - Column 4, Lines 1-18; Column 8, Lines 31-42 & 56-63);*

See the Final Office Action at page 3. Initially, the Applicant points out that even though Eichert discloses a plurality of network devices in Figure 1, **Eichert does not disclose or suggest a "plurality of access point groups."** The Applicant further points out that **Figures 1 and 3 of Eichert do not disclose or suggest that a policy is associated with an access point group**, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. For example, Figure 1 of Eichert illustrates a schematic diagram of a general network and its connected network devices. *See* Eichert, col. 6, lines 47-48. Furthermore, in order to implement the system policy, Eichert discloses that a network manager uses a single management station, such as the management station 100 of Figure 1, in order to specify policy for a network. *See id.* at Figure 1 and col. 2, lines 46-47.

Figure 3 of Eichert describes in greater detail how the management station 100 handles policies. For example, Eichert discloses that **an active packet is created based on the input rules describing the policy**. *See id.* at col. 8, lines 31-55 and Figure 3. After the active packet is created, encoded, and signed, the **packet (or an instruction to retrieve the packet) is transferred to a network device**. *See id.* Figure 3, step 370. In other words, Eichert handles policy processing by using active packets which are communicated by the management station to a network device. Eichert does not disclose a plurality of access point groups and associating policy with a particular one of the access point groups, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

7

As shown above, neither Eichert nor Forslow teach or suggest "associating said at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Eichert and Forslow does not render independent claim 1 unpatentable, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable. The Examiner has rejected independent claims 10 and 19 using the same rationale as used for claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 10 and 19 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant reserves the right to argue additional reasons for the allowability of claims 1, 10, and 19.

A2.   Examiner's Response to Arguments in the Final Office Action

The Examiner states the following in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Final Office Action:

> The argued feature of associating at least one policy with a particular one of access point roups reads upon Eichert et al. in view of Forslow as follows. Eichert et al. is disclosing a system of policy management in a network including multiple nodes. **They disclose distributing policies for management to one or a group of network devices** which are known in the art to provide connectivity to groups of users. Therefore, disclosing the limitation of "associating said at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups." Forslow discusses a policy distributing process for a wireless local area network.

See the Final Office Action at page 2 (emphasis added). The Applicant points out that the first relevant claim limitation from Applicant's claim 1 is "a plurality of access point groups." As explained in the May 3, 2007 response, neither Forslow nor Eichert disclose a plurality of access point groups. More importantly, neither Forslow nor Eichert disclose associating a policy with a particular one of the access point groups. The Examiner is alleging that Eichert discloses "distributing policies for management to one or a group of network devices" (see bolded statement above. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. **Eichert, on numerous occasions, states that a new policy, represented by an object file, is communicated <u>only to a single device (not an access point group)</u>, and is used to define how the specific network device (not an access point group) should behave when confronted with a particular situation.** *See* Eichert at col. 4, lines 1-8, as well as col. 12, lines 33-53. Forslow does not overcome the deficiencies of Eichert. Therefore, the Applicant maintains that the combination of Eichert and Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "associating said at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2, 11, and 20

Claims 2, 11, and 20 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 2, 11, and 20 are allowable over the

references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "identifying said associated policy to be distributed to said particular one of said access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in claim 2.

With regard to claim 2, the Final Office Action states the following at page 6:

Consider claim 2, as applied to claim 1 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses identifying said associated policy to be distributed to said particular one of said access point groups *(Eichert et al. - Column 2, Lines 6-27; Column 7, Lines 1-6 & 48-56)*.

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that a system administrator may input instructions representing policy through an interface, Eichert clearly does not disclose or suggest that the management station 100, or any other device on Eichert's network, identifies the associated policy that is to be distributed to a particular one of access point groups.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 2 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 20 using the same rationale as used for claim 2. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 11 and 20 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2, 11, and 20.

C.   Rejection of Dependent Claims 3, 12, and 21

Claims 3, 12, and 21 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 3, 12, and 21 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "conditioning said selection of said identified policy upon occurrence of an event," as recited by the Applicant in claim 3.

> With regard to claim 3, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:
>
> Consider claim 3, as applied to claim 2 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses conditioning said selection of said identified policy upon occurrence of an event *(Eichert et al. - Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56).*

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that the object file is retrieved as soon as it is available on a directory server or distributed database, Eichert clearly does not disclose or suggest that selection of the identified policy is conditioned upon occurrence of an event, as recited by the Applicant in claim 3.

11

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 3 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 12 and 21 using the same rationale as used for claim 3. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 12 and 21 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 3, 12, and 21.

D. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 13, and 22

Claims 4, 13, and 22 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 4, 13, and 22 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "said distributing comprises distributing said identified policy to said particular one of said access point groups upon said occurrence of said event," as recited by the Applicant in claim 4.

With regard to claim 4, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

Consider claim 4, as applied to claim 3 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses distributing said identified policy to said particular one of said access point groups upon said occurrence of said event *(Eichert et al. - Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56; Column 8, Lines 31-42; Column 9, Lines 1-10).*

12

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that the new policy object file may be retrieved by the enforcement device (column 4) and distributed throughout the network (column 8), Eichert clearly does not disclose or suggest distributing of the identified policy to a particular one of the access point groups, as recited by the Applicant in claim 4.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 4 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 22 using the same rationale as used for claim 4. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 13 and 22 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4, 13, and 22.

E.   Rejection of Dependent Claims 5, 14, and 23

Claims 5, 14, and 23 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 5, 14, and 23 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "associating said at least one policy with a particular access point

in said particular one of said access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in claim

5.

With regard to claim 5, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

Consider claim 5, as applied to claim 4 above, Eichert et al. as modified
by Forslow further discloses associating said at least one policy with a
particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups
*(Eichert et al. - Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56; Column 8,
Lines 31-42; Column 9, Lines 1-32).*

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Eichert discloses, at the

above citations, that the new policy object file may be retrieved by the enforcement

device (column 4) and distributed throughout the network (column 8), Eichert clearly

does not disclose or suggest associating the policy with a particular access point in the

particular one of the access point groups, as recited by the Applicant in claim 5.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 5 is allowable over the references

cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has

rejected claims 14 and 23 using the same rationale as used for claim 5. Therefore, the

Applicant submits that claims 14 and 23 are also allowable over the references cited in

the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those

set forth above to support the allowability of claims 5, 14, and 23.

F.   Rejection of Dependent Claims 6, 15, and 24

Claims 6, 15, and 24 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 6, 15, and 24 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "said distributing comprises distributing said identified policy to said particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in claim 6.

With regard to claim 6, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

Consider claim 6, as applied to claim 5 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses distributing said identified policy to said particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups *(Eichert et al. - Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56; Column 8, Lines 31-42; Column 9, Lines 1-32).*

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that the new policy object file may be retrieved by the enforcement device (column 4) and distributed throughout the network (column 8), Eichert clearly does not disclose or suggest distributing of the identified policy to the particular access point in the particular one of the access point groups, as recited by the Applicant in claim 6.

15

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 15 and 24 using the same rationale as used for claim 6. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 15 and 24 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 6, 15, and 24.

G.   Rejection of Dependent Claims 7, 16, and 25

Claims 7, 16, and 25 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 7, 16, and 25 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "communicating said at least one policy from at least one of a switch and a server to at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in claim 7.

With regard to claim 7, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

Consider claim 7, as applied to claim 1 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses communicating said at least one policy from at least one of a switch and a server to at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups *(Eichert et al. – Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56; Column 8, Lines 31-42; Column 9, Lines 1-32).*

16

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that the new policy object file may be retrieved by the enforcement device (column 4) and distributed throughout the network (column 8), Eichert clearly does not disclose or suggest communicating the at least one policy from a switch and/or a server to at least one access point in the plurality of access point groups, as recited by the Applicant in claim 7.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 25 using the same rationale as used for claim 7. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 16 and 25 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 7, 16, and 25.

H.   Rejection of Dependent Claims 8, 17, and 26

Claims 8, 17, and 26 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 8, 17, and 26 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "broadcasting said at least one policy from said at least one of a switch and a server to said at least a portion of said plurality of access point groups," as recited by the Applicant in claim 8.

With regard to claim 8, the Final Office Action states the following at pages 7-8:

> Consider claim 8, as applied to claim 7 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses broadcasting said at least one policy from said at least one of a switch and a server to said at least a portion of said plurality of access point groups *(Eichert et al. - Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56; Column 8, Lines 31-42; Column 9, Lines 1-32 :: Forslow-Page 3, Paragraph 0034; Page 4, paragraph 0066; Page 5, Paragraph 0088; page 6, paragraph 0095).*

Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that the new policy object file may be retrieved by the enforcement device (column 4) and distributed throughout the network (column 8) or to enforcement devices (column 9). Forslow discloses MANET enhancement of routing protocols (¶ 0034), components of a mobile VPN (¶ 0066), basic components in a network-based mobile workgroup system (¶ 0088), and forming of virtual overlay networks (¶ 0095). However, neither Eichert nor Forslow disclose broadcasting the at least one policy from the switch and/or the server to the at least a portion of the plurality of access point groups, as recited in Applicant's claim 8.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 8 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 26 using the same rationale as used for claim 8. Therefore, the

18

Applicant submits that claims 17 and 26 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 8, 17, and 26.

I.   Rejection of Dependent Claims 9, 18, and 27

Claims 9, 18, and 27 depend on independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 9, 18, and 27 are allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to the allowability of claim 1.

The Applicant also submits that Eichert-Forslow does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "distributing said at least one policy via at least one messaging protocol message," as recited by the Applicant in claim 9.

With regard to claim 9, the Final Office Action states the following at page 8:

Consider claim 9, as applied to claim 8 above, Eichert et al. as modified by Forslow further discloses distributing said at least one policy via at least one messaging protocol message *(Eichert et al. - Column 4, Lines 1-19; Column 7, Lines 48-56; Column 8, Lines 31-42; Column 9, Lines 1-32 :: Forslow - Page 3, Paragraph 0034; Page 4, paragraph 0066; Page 5, Paragraph 0088; page 6, paragraph 0095).*

Eichert discloses, at the above citations, that the new policy object file may be retrieved by the enforcement device (column 4) and distributed throughout the network

19

(column 8) or to enforcement devices (column 9). Forslow discloses MANET enhancement of routing protocols (¶ 0034), components of a mobile VPN (¶ 0066), basic components in a network-based mobile workgroup system (¶ 0088), and forming of virtual overlay networks (¶ 0095). However, neither Eichert nor Forslow disclose distributing the at least one policy via at least one messaging protocol message, as recited in Applicant's claim 9. In fact, neither Eichert nor Forslow disclose any distribution of protocol messages.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 9 is allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons. The Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 27 using the same rationale as used for claim 9. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 18 and 27 are also allowable over the references cited in the Final Office Action at least based on the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 9, 18, and 27.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the Examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are therefore requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge $510 (to cover the Brief on Appeal Fee) and any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 07-JAN-2008   By: /Ognyan I. Beremski/
                                         Ognyan Beremski, Reg. No. 51,458
                                         Attorney for Applicant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775 – 8100

(OIB)

CLAIMS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1.   A method for hardware acceleration in a hybrid wired/wireless local area network, the method comprising:

creating at least one policy to be distributed among at least one of a plurality of access point groups;

associating said at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups; and

distributing said associated at least one policy to at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups.

2.   The method according to claim 1, comprising identifying said associated policy to be distributed to said particular one of said access point groups.

3.   The method according to claim 2, comprising conditioning said selection of said identified policy upon occurrence of an event.

4.   The method according to claim 3, wherein said distributing comprises distributing said identified policy to said particular one of said access point groups upon said occurrence of said event.

5.   The method according to claim 4, comprising associating said at least one policy with a particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups.

6.   The method according to claim 5, wherein said distributing comprises distributing said identified policy to said particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups.

7.   The method according to claim 1, comprising communicating said at least one policy from at least one of a switch and a server to at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups.

8.   The method according to claim 7, comprising broadcasting said at least one policy from said at least one of a switch and a server to said at least a portion of said plurality of access point groups.

9.   The method according to claim 8, comprising distributing said at least one policy via at least one messaging protocol message.

10.   A machine-readable storage, having stored thereon a computer program having at least one code section for hardware acceleration in a hybrid wired/wireless local area network, the at least one code section executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform the steps comprising:

23

creating said at least one policy to be distributed among at least one of a plurality of access point groups;

associating at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups; and

distributing said associated at least one policy to at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups.

11. The machine-readable according to claim 10, comprising code for identifying said associated policy to be distributed to said particular one of said access point groups.

12. The machine-readable according to claim 11, comprising code for conditioning said selection of said identified policy upon occurrence of an event.

13. The machine-readable according to claim 12, wherein said distributing code comprises code for distributing said identified policy to said particular one of said access point groups upon said occurrence of said event.

14. The machine-readable according to claim 13, comprising associating said at least one policy with a particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups.

15.   The machine-readable according to claim 14, wherein said distributing code comprises code for distributing said identified policy to said particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups.

16.   The machine-readable according to claim 10, comprising code for communicating said at least one policy from at least one of a switch and a server to said one or more access point in said plurality of access point groups.

17.   The machine-readable according to claim 16, comprising code for broadcasting said at least one policy from said at least one of a switch and a server to at least a portion of said plurality of access point groups.

18.   The machine-readable according to claim 17, comprising code for distributing said at least one policy via at least one messaging protocol message.

19.   A system for hardware acceleration in a hybrid wired/wireless local area network, the system comprising:

means for creating at least one policy to be distributed among at least one of a plurality of access point groups;

means for associating said at least one policy with a particular one of said access point groups; and

means for distributing said associated at least one policy to at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups.

20.   The system according to claim 19, comprising means for identifying said associated policy to be distributed to said particular one of said access point groups.

21.   The system according to claim 20, comprising means for conditioning said selection of said identified policy upon occurrence of an event.

22.   The system according to claim 21, wherein said means for distributing comprises means for distributing said identified policy to said particular one of said access point groups upon said occurrence of said event.

23.   The system according to claim 22, comprising means for associating said at least one policy with a particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups.

24.   The system according to claim 23, wherein said means for distributing comprises means for distributing said identified policy to said particular access point in said particular one of said access point groups.

25.   The system according to claim 19, comprising means for communicating said at least one policy from at least one of a switch and a server to said at least one access point in said plurality of access point groups.

26.   The system according to claim 25, comprising means for broadcasting said at least one policy from said at least one of a switch and a server to at least a portion of said plurality of access point groups.

27.   The system according to claim 26, comprising means for distributing said at least one policy via at least one messaging protocol message.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

(1)   United States Patent No. 6,393,474 ("Eichert"), entered into record by the Examiner

in the January 3, 2007 Office Action.

(2)   United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069278 ("Forslow"),

entered into record by the Examiner in the January 3, 2007 Office Action.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.